

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT. 19 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 TO THE JULY 19, 2006 OFFICE ACTION

*Please Enter
D
11/1/06*

APPLICANT: Tom Weidner GROUP ART UNIT: 2615
SERIAL NO.: 10/659,230 EXAMINER: Daniel Swerdlow
FILED: September 10, 2003 CONFIRMATION NO.: 3480
TITLE: FEEDBACK COMPENSATION METHOD AND CIRCUIT FOR
AN ACOUSTIC AMPLIFICATION SYSTEM, AND HEARING AID
DEVICE EMPLOYING SAME

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

S I R:

Applicant and his counsel have carefully reviewed the Final Rejection dated July 19, 2006, but believe the claims in their present form are patentable over the teachings of the references relied upon by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following arguments in support of patentability is therefore respectfully requested.

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 19, 2006, claims 1, 10-12, 14-36, 45-47 and 49-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kates '986. Claims 1-9 and 36-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kates '884. Claims 13 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kates '986 in view of Weidner.

Applicant notes with appreciation the interview courteously afforded the undersigned representative of the Applicant on October 18, 2006. The discussion at the interview focused on the Kates '986 reference, namely whether the frozen filter